

### **REMARKS**

Claims 7-14 remain pending in the present invention. Claims 1-6 have been cancelled. Claims 7 and 8 have been amended. Claims 9-14 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Ito, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,641,768) in view of Smith, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,579,485).

In amended Claim 7 of the present invention, the recess portions are overlapped with outlets of the runners for supplying an injection material into the mold. Therefore, the injecting material is injected from the outlets of the runners in the overlapped state where the recess portions (10b) are overlapped with the outlets (21b) of the runners (21), as shown in Fig. 2A. Accordingly, temperature of the injected material is effectively increased by the shearing heat. The increase in temperature enables strengthening of the adhesion around the recess portions (notches 10b), thereby increasing adhesion strength between the outer peripheral portion (10a) and the seal member (12).

Ito, et al. ('768) does not describe anything regarding the recess portions formed on the outer peripheral portion of the door body. Therefore, there is no positional relationship between the recess portions of the door body and the outlets of the runners.

Smith, et al. has a recessed portion between two elements 10, but these recesses are not provided on the D-ring 1 which is the element inserted into the mold.

Amended Claim 7 defines the step of forming a door having a plurality of recess portions and then inserting the formed door in a mold at a predetermined position such that the recess portions overlap with the outlets of runners. Thus, it is clearly defined that the element (door body) which is inserted into the mold has a plurality of recesses before it is inserted into the mold. The plurality of recesses defined by the Examiner are created after the element (D-ring 1) is inserted into the mold. The recesses are not present in the element which is inserted into the mold.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 7, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 8, which depends from Claim 7, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **NEW CLAIMS**

New Claims 9-11 are dependent claims which ultimately depend from Claim 7 and Applicants believe they properly further limit Claim 7.

New Claim 12 is a new independent claim which Applicants believe also clearly define the inserted door body as having the recesses. New Claims 13 and 14 ultimately depend from Claim 12 and Applicants believe they properly further limit Claim 12.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 16, 2004

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg